IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:-

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR.H.L.DATTU
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.N.RAVINDRAN

FRIDAY, THE 14TH DECEMBER 2007 / 23RD AGRAHAYANA 1929

W.A.No.765 of 2005

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT IN O.P.14735/1998 DATED 09/02/2005

.....

APPELLANT/ 2ND PETITIONER:-

R.B.SREEKUMAR,
JR.EXECUTIVE (MARKETING),
KERALA STATE DRUGS AND PHARMACEUTICALS LTD.,
KALAVOOR,
ALAPPUZHA.

BY ADV. DR.K.P.KYLASANATHA PILLAY
SRI.T.P.DEYANANTHAN
SMT.SREEDEVI KYLASANATH
SMT.S.PREETHA

RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS:-

---

1. STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
INDUSTRIES DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. KERALA STATE DRUGS AND PHARMACEUTICALS LTD.,
KALAVOOR,
ALAPPUZHA-688 522,
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.

R1 BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER MR.M.P.SREEKRISHNAN
R2 BY STANDING COUNSEL SRI.P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 14/12/2007, ALONG WITH W.A.NO.636 OF 2005, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

H.L.Dattu,C.J. & P.N.Ravindran,J.

W.A.Nos.765 of 2005 & 636 of 2005

Dated, this the 14th day of December, 2007

JUDGMENT

H.L.Dattu,C.J.

W.A.No.765 of 2005 arises out of an order passed by the learned Single Judge in O.P.No.14735 of 1998 dated 9.2.2005.

(2) W.A.No.636 of 2005 arises out of an order passed by the learned Single Judge in O.P.No.32546 of 2001 dated 9.2.2005.

(3) By the impugned orders, the learned Single Judge had rejected the Original Petitions. Aggrieved by the orders so passed by the learned Single Judge, the 2nd petitioner in O.P.No.14735 of 1998, who is the sole petitioner in O.P.No.32546 of 2001, is before us in these two appeals.

(4) Dr.K.P.Kylasanatha Pillay, learned counsel appearing for the appellant would submit that during the pendency of these appeals, the 2nd respondent has granted major portion of the reliefs sought for by the appellant. The learned counsel would also submit that he is entitled to some consequential reliefs.

(5) Taking note of the statement made by the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, these appeals are disposed of as having become unnecessary.

(6) Liberty is also reserved to the appellant, if he so desires, to approach the respondent authorities for all the consequential benefits by making an appropriate application. Needless to say, if such an application is made, the authorities should consider the same in accordance with law and pass appropriate orders.

(7) In view of the orders passed in the Writ Appeals, all pending interlocutory applications shall stand dismissed.

Ordered accordingly.

H.L.Dattu
Chief Justice

P.N.Ravindran
Judge

vku/-